

**MSR Stakeholder Working Group**  
Orange/Villa Park/Orange Sphere of Influence  
July 9, 2004  
Meeting Notes

The meeting began shortly after 10:00 am.

**Public Comment:**

There was no request from the public to speak.

**Agenda/Desired Outcomes:**

The facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda and desired outcomes as follows:

- Technical Brainstorming Committee status reports
- Feedback, discussion, Q and A

**Technical Brainstorm Committee Updates:**

■ Unincorporated Areas Governance and Fiscal:

- List of committee participants was shared – it was noted that in addition to those listed one additional party, the City of Orange was invited to join the committee
- Overview of the brainstormed list of what is important to the affected groups for the future of the area: OPA, North Tustin, County, LAFCO, City of Orange:
  - OPA
    - Septic-Sewer
    - Land use – Overlay of County General Plan
    - Water – OPA Mutual Water Company
    - Curbs and gutters
    - Street lights
    - Future impacts from East Orange
      - Traffic
    - Local accountability/local voice
    - Property taxes/assessments/fees
    - Property values
    - Urban runoff/water quality – Handy Creek (Larry McKenney/City of Orange)
  - NORTH TUSTIN
    - “Stabilization” – Community identity and quality of life
      - Rural environment and sense of place
      - Land use and *densities* (land value)
      - Curbs, gutters, street lights

- No annexation?
  - Septic-Sewer
  - Property values
  - Property taxes/assessments/fees
  - Traffic
  - Sphere of influence boundaries
- COUNTY
  - Annexation of small islands
  - Engage in discussions and outreach with large islands “but not push”
  - Finances – municipal vs. regional service costs
  - Urban runoff/water quality
- LAFCO
  - Annexation of small and large islands as a policy focus toward service delivery efficiency/equity
  - Engage in discussions and outreach with large islands
  - Build collaborations to facilitate improved service delivery
  - Establish strategic plan for annexation or alternate service provision options with workplan implementation timeline
- Next steps:
  - Complete definition of future problems, concerns & challenges
  - Brainstorm options, alternatives, strategies for future
- Comments:
  - A SWG member asked if the discussions should include the canyons, particularly if the East Orange development area is annexed to the City of Orange. LAFCO feedback indicated that the scope of the unincorporated areas discussion is specifically looking at the recognized “island” areas currently within city boundaries.
  - The importance of education as a primary tool was mentioned due to its value for all possible affected/involved parties.

## ■ Open Space Resources

- Presentation included a review of the members and new invitees. Two additional parties were asked to participate in the process: Jerry King, open space advisor and George Bloecher, technical advisor.
- Objectives/Challenges
  - Define scope of open space planning efforts
  - Discuss creating partnerships for future open space agreements and acquisitions
  - Identify trail systems and links: Existing & Future
- The group identified the following action items:
  - Explore possibilities of county-wide open space planning
  - Explore potential of special districts
    - Potential revenue sources

- Grant funds
  - Government collaboration
- Address environmental challenges
- Comments:
  - A SWG member suggested that the committee may want to include in the discussion: Tim Neely & Tom Miller, County parks department staff, and Lynn McAfee, Director of the Nature Reserve of OC
  - Coordinate with water districts as they also are key players in open space uses because of the need for reservoir placement
  - A comment was made that this might be a good time for the district to consider the role the existing parks and recreation district plays now and if there is a broader role for that organization in the future, forming partnerships and/or coordinating with other existing organizations on the issue of maintaining and managing open space areas

#### ■ Septic-Sewer Conversion

- List of committee participants was shared – it was noted that in addition to those listed two additional parties, the City of Orange and IRWD were invited to join the committee. Representatives from both entities indicated they are inputting the MSR process relative to sewers in other ways.
- Overview of the scope of the meeting discussions included defining the problem/reasons for change, identifying key future challenges, i.e.: infrastructure costs, connection costs, governance issues for converting properties in OPA and North Tustin from septic systems to local sewer service
- Next steps:
  - Define what the challenges are: complete the sewer infrastructure master plan
  - Brainstorm options, alternatives, strategies to address future service delivery, governance and infrastructure challenges
- Comments:
  - A SWG noted that perhaps the City of Tustin should be asked to participate due to discussions including the North Tustin unincorporated area
  - Understanding/knowledge of the regulatory environment is an important consideration in future approaches – the group may want to invite Jerry King, Regional Water Quality Control Board to participate
  - Also from a regulatory standpoint, a technical analysis of which areas should be on sewer from an environmental basis and which can remain on septic would be useful

- The importance of education as a primary tool was mentioned due to its value for all possible affected/involved parties.
- **Water/Wastewater/Urban Runoff**
  - List of committee participants was shared
  - Overview of the major challenges and key focus areas for wastewater, urban runoff and water was presented:
    - **Major Challenges and Key Focus Areas for Wastewater** – The following key issues were identified with respect to **Wastewater**:
      - **Key Issue** – Long range plan to transition areas where retail service is currently provided by OCSD to local service providers. OCSD's focus and funding strategy is as a regional (non-retail) service provider
        - IRWD and OCSD have been working closely together in coordinating the transition of retail sewer service in other areas (e.g., Irvine Business Complex and south Tustin area) and will continue to coordinate in future transitions.
        - OCSD District No. 7 (North Tustin area) is currently served by OCSD and lies within the East Orange MSR Study area. This area could eventually be served by Tustin or IRWD.
        - There are some unincorporated island pockets in the Orange area served by OCSD local sewers that may be best served by the City of Orange.
      - **Key Issue** – How to determine the most logical service provider in new growing areas.
      - **Key Issue** – How will the retail service provider generate a revenue stream and what method of collection will they use (i.e. direct billing versus property tax bill).
      - **Key Issue** – Septic tank conversion
        - Although this topic is being discussed by another brainstorming group, this group felt it is an important regional issue that should be discussed by the current and prospective wastewater service providers.
        - Criteria should be developed among wastewater and regulatory agencies to determine what areas in and adjacent to the study area need to be converted to sanitary sewers versus remaining on septic systems.

Environmental impacts, costs, feasibility and other factors should be considered.

- Some attention should be given to taking a look at the current process for annexing an area into OCSD.  
(Action item: Jim Herberg to provide info)
- **Key Issue – Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order R8-2002-0014 for Sanitary Sewers**
  - CA RWQCB 8 (Santa Ana Region) enacted WDRs on April 26, 2002 covering the funding, planning, design, construction, inspection, management, operation, maintenance and renewal of sewer systems in the Orange County area within their jurisdiction. OCSD, IRWD and their satellite cities and sewerage agencies are developing compliance plans at this time. These local WDRs may serve as a future statewide model that this MSR and other LAFCOs MSRs should be aware of. (Nick can provide added info and a copy of the WDR Order if needed.)
- **Major Challenges and Key Focus Areas for Urban Runoff –** The group identified the following key issues relating to Urban Runoff:
  - **Key Issue –** Urban runoff is a cross jurisdictional issue that will involve many different service providers working closely together.
    - Services relating to urban runoff differ from more typical municipal services because runoff follows watershed boundaries that overlap many jurisdictional boundaries.
    - The East Orange MSR study area covers two distinct watersheds (Santa Ana River and San Diego Creek). Portions of these watersheds lie outside the East Orange study area and the County of Orange.
    - OCSD's Source Control Division has retained a consultant to perform a study of its current Urban runoff Diversion Program. Only limited sewer hydraulic capacity and treatment facility capacity are available at this time. Flows are currently being accommodated in some areas of the County.

- **Key Issue** – Identification of Best Management Practices (BMP's) that can be employed to mitigate urban runoff problems.
  - Some urban runoff is now treated at existing regional wastewater plants making urban runoff a wastewater issue too.
  - Some urban runoff is, and will be, treated by managed treatment wetlands planned for the area.
  - runoff control measures include education, source control, water conservation and other programs/management techniques.
  - Newly developing areas in and around the MSR study area should be planned to employ the lowest cost and most effective control, management and treatment options needed to provide regulatory compliance.
  - The appropriate role for each agency (city, county, special districts) in implementing planned BMP's needs to be established considering regulatory responsibilities, financing capabilities and technical expertise.
- **Key Issue** – How to generate the revenue needed to provide urban runoff services.
- **Key Issue** – The protection of open space areas and local water bodies from urban runoff.
  - Open space has been identified as a key area of concern by the larger Stakeholder's Working Group. With that in mind, this issue should be coordinated with other SWG members interested in this topic.
- **Major Challenges and Key Focus Areas for Water** – The group identified the following key issues relating to Water:
  - **Key Issue** – Documenting on-going cooperative agreement between water agencies
    - There has been a long history of cooperation between water agencies, which is sometimes not visible to non water purveyor service providers. An inventory of cooperative agreements among current water service

providers on the SWG should be initiated (best done via email).

- Other future opportunities exist for cooperation between agencies including (1) the proposed MWDSC Cleveland Tunnel Project, (2) future groundwater development projects, and (3) additional system interconnections.
- **Key Issue** – Reviewing the reasons area water agencies were originally established and determining if those reasons are still valid.
  - One good vehicle for examining this issue might be the recently developed list of water agency reliability criteria.

### **Follow-up Items:**

- Each Brainstorm Committee will present a more refined report to the SWG at the August 13 meeting that will define the future challenges of the issue area and address key options, alternatives and strategies for addressing the issues
- The reports will become part of the 20-year vision plan document
- The SWG will decide collectively if there are any preferred alternatives it would like to highlight in the vision plan

### **Adjournment**

The meeting concluded and was adjourned shortly after 11:00 pm.